

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-3 and 7-20 are pending in the application. Claims 18-20 are allowed. Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 13-17 are rejected.

Claims 6 and 10-12 are objected to.

Claim 6

Claim 6 is objected to for being in improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 1. Claim 6 is cancelled.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, 15 and 16

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by previously cited Gotoh.

In response to Applicant's previous argument that Gotoh neither teaches nor suggests that the second edge surface is specularly or diffusely reflecting, the Examiner has stated that surface 14 is highly reflecting, which meets the definition of specularly reflecting, citing para. [0050], lines 1, 2 and 9-11.

However, Applicant claims a specularly or diffusely reflecting surface, and Gotoh nowhere mentions or even hints that surface 14 may be anything other than highly reflecting.

Thus, Gotoh fails to anticipate claim 1, since:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim."

Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Since Gotoh fails to disclose all of the elements of claim

1, it does not anticipate claim 1.

Accordingly, claims 1-3, 7, 8, 13, 15 and 16 are not anticipated by Gotoh, and the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claim 17

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by previously cited Nakabayashi.

In response to Applicant's previous argument that Nakabayashi's surfaces (243) are not parallel to the front surface (321, 322), the Examiner has stated that surfaces (243) are 'substantially' parallel to the front surface, as required by Applicant's claim language.

However, Nakabayashi teaches that the light guide member 203 is wedge shaped, so that face 231 of the light guide member 203 is tilted so as to be gradually closer to the face 232 of the light guide member 203 with increasing distance from the light source 1. That is, $d_1 > d_2$. See para. [0196].

Thus, a surface (243) which lies in a tilted face (203) cannot be considered 'substantially parallel' to an untilted surface (232).

Accordingly, claim 17 is not anticipated by Nakabayashi, and the rejection is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 14

Claims 9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gotoh in view of Lammers U.S. patent 6,672,734.

Regarding claim 9, Lammers discloses an illumination system and display device which includes a diffuser (28) positioned between the backlight 1 and the LCD panel 34. The diffuser (28) is described as a polarizing diffuser. See col. 7, line 55. Nowhere does Lammers describe filter 28 as a translucent diffuser.


While not conceding the patentability per se of claim 14, it is pointed out that claim 14 is patentable by virtue of its dependency, for the reasons already advanced with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 9 and 14 over Gotoh in view of Lammers is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. However, in view of the above arguments and amendments, it is felt that all of the pending claims are in allowable form.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections and rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be otherwise in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Fox, Reg. 24,975
Consulting Patent Attorney
315-521-2627